

REMARKS

Claims 1-9 are pending in the application. In the Office Action, the pending claims were rejected as follows: Claim 1, 3, 4 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,466,292 (Kim) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,956,656 (Yamazaki); Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Kim in view of Yamazaki and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,141,540 (Richards et al.); and Claims 7, 8 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Kim in view of Richards et al. and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0,065,110 A1 (Enns et al.).

Claims 1 and 3 have been amended. No new subject matter is presented.

There are three independent claims pending in this application, Claims 1, 7 and 8.

Claims 7 and 8 were rejected in view of a combination of references that includes Enns et al. Notably, Enns et al. was not filed until September 13, 2001, which is after the January 17, 2001 priority date of this application. For completeness, it is noted that Enns et al. claims priority to U. S. Provisional Application No. 60/237,330, which was filed on October 2, 2000. However, review of U. S. Provisional Application no. 60/237,330 reveals that this priority document fails to provide support for the disclosure cited by the Examiner in the Enns et al. Accordingly, Enns et al. is not prior art to the pending application. A copy of the Enns et al. provisional application is enclosed for the Examiner's convenience.

Claim 1 was rejected as allegedly being unpatentable over Kim and Yamazaki. Claim 1 has been amended to include the recitation of *slidingly displaying the received message on the first display*. Claim 3 has also been amended to clarify the manner of sliding. In regard to

Claim 3, the Examiner alleged that “Yamazaki teaches where the received message is moved by shifting the received message by a predetermined number of bytes (column 6, lines 5-15)” (Office Action, bottom of page 3).

Contrary to the Examiner’s assertion, Yamazaki fails to disclose or suggest *slidinely displaying* a received message. Rather, Yamazaki discloses sequentially displaying each of a series of messages on its display, with a new message being displayed “every time the user pushes the control switch (SW) 15” (Col. 6, lines 11-12), and each message “is displayed in the received order” (Col. 6, lines 12-13). It is clear in Yamazaki that when the switch is pushed during display of the message, the next message is displayed.

Accordingly, neither Yamazaki, nor any of the other cited references, discloses or suggests the recitation of *slidinely displaying the received message on the first display* of amended Claim 1.

Without conceding the patentability *per se* of the dependent claims, it is submitted that dependent Claims 2-6 and 9 are allowable for the above reasons, at least by virtue of their respective dependency upon Claims 1 and 8. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicant’s attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Farrell

Reg. No. 33,494
Attorney for Applicant

DILWORTH & BARRESE
333 Earle Ovington Blvd.
Uniondale, New York 11553
Tel: (516) 228-8484
Enclosure: U. S. Provisional Application No. 60/237,330